

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 41 are pending in the application. Claims 1-41 stand rejected. Claims 8, 12 and 13 are amended and new claims 42 and 43 are added without adding new matter. Claim 7 is canceled without prejudice. The description is amended to add further identifying information not available when the international application was filed. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

New independent claim 42 includes a mass further including an active region and a passive region, and one or more substantially rigid members for attaching at least one point on the surface to the package to create a resilient coupling between the mass and the package, wherein the at least one point is in the passive region and at least a portion of the active region is spaced apart from the at least one point of attachment.

New independent claim 43 includes a mass having an active region and a passive region, attaching at least one surface point on mass to a package using one or more substantially rigid members to create a resilient coupling between the mass and the package, wherein the at least one point of attachment is in the passive region and at least a portion of the active region is spaced apart from the at least one point of attachment.

Support for the passive region is found at page 11 describing passive region 140 shown in Figure 1A.

Claim 7 is canceled without prejudice.

Claim 8 is amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 8 is further amended to change “the first passive region is...” to “the mass includes a passive region...”.

Claim 12 is amended to delete the word “first” appearing before “active region.”

Claim 13 is amended to delete a redundant reference to the active region which is already introduced in claim 1.

35 USC § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Takahashi* (US 5,540,593). Applicant respectfully submits that the ‘593 reference does not anticipate the independent claims and does not teach the elements originally found in the dependent claims as discussed below.

In the final rejection, the Examiner introduces a new assertion that ‘593 teaches a package (7), a mass (9) coupled to the package, the mass including an active region (top surface) spaced apart from the at least one point of attachment (bottom surface), one or more substantially rigid members or one or more resilient couplings (P1) for attaching the at least one point on the surface to the package.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 25, the ‘593 reference does not mention an active region. The examiner appears to use wording from applicants disclosure without reasoning as to how the top surface of the integrated circuit taught in ‘593 is “an active region”.

The Examiner asserts that element P1 teaches one or more substantially rigid members **or** one or more resilient couplings for attaching the at least one point on the surface to the package (emphasis added). Applicant would respectfully point out that the

original claim element substantially rigid members for attaching *at least one point on the surface to the package to create a resilient coupling between the mass and the package*. The Examiner's reading of the element as rigid members **or** resilient coupling is in error. The italicized portion of the original claims clearly shows that the one or more rigid members are not an alternative to a resilient coupling.

The examiner asserts that element P1 of the '593 reference satisfies the claimed element of a substantially rigid member coupling the mass to the package. Element P1 is only that portion of coil element 1 that contacts the IC element 9. P1 alone cannot attach the IC 9 to the package 7, and coil element 1 is not a substantially rigid member. Therefore, '593 does not teach one or more substantially rigid members for attaching at least one point on the surface to the package.

Regarding new claims 42 and 43, nothing in '593 describes a passive region of a mass where a point of attachment is in the passive region.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that '593 does not teach each and every element of independent claims 1 and 25 or of new claims 42 and 43. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In addition to missing elements of the independent claims, Applicant submits that the examiner has not addressed any dependent claim and that the '593 reference fails to teach the several elements originally found in the dependent claims.

As to claims 4-5, the art of record does not teach or suggest bond pads having a cross-sectional shape selected from the group consisting of approximately rectangular, approximately oval, approximately tri-oval, approximately oct-oval, approximately wavy sided rectangular, approximately oct-pie-wedge, approximately hollow oct-pie-wedge, approximately nine-circular, approximately starburst, or approximately sunburst.

As to claim 6, the art of record does not teach or suggest bond pads that are approximately located in the passive regions.

As to claim 8, the art of record does not teach or suggest a passive region located at one end of a mass.

As to claims 9 and 31, the art of record does not teach or suggest a mass further comprising a first passive region and a second passive region, wherein bond pads are located in the first passive region and the second passive region.

As to claim 10, the art of record does not teach or suggest a first passive region located at one end of the mass and wherein the second passive region is located at the opposite end of the mass.

As to claims 11-12 and 33-34, the art of record does not teach or suggest a first passive region integral to the active region; and wherein the bond pads are located in the first passive region or wherein the first passive region is located at one end of the mass; and wherein the active region is located at the opposite end of the mass.

As to claims 13-14 and 30, the art of record does not teach or suggest a the bond pads are located in the approximate center of the active region.

As to claim 15, the art of record does not teach or suggest rigid members having a cross-sectional shape that is approximately rectangular or approximately circular.

As to claim 17, the art of record does not teach or suggest rigid members that are approximately located at the approximate center of the package.

As to claim 19, the art of record does not teach or suggest rigid members that are a material selected from the group consisting of solder, conductive epoxy, non-conductive epoxy, and glass frit.

As to claims 20-21 and 37-39, the art of record does not teach or suggest sliding supports coupled to the package for slidingly supporting the mass or the claimed cross-sectional shape.

As to claim 22, the art of record does not teach or suggest a package including a pedestal for supporting the rigid members.


As to claims 35, 36 and 40 the art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed permitting of expansion and contraction without inducing stresses.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record. The fee for the request for continued examination and the fee for the additional claims are submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee due for this response and to credit any overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 13-0010 (IO-1015US)**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 7, 2003


Todd A. Bynum, Reg. No. 39,488
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.
2603 Augusta, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77057-5638
Tel: (713) 266-1130
Fax: (713) 266-8510
Attorney For Applicants